

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-4 and 7-14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffel (WO/99/01001) in view of English (US 5,870,674) and Bamburak et al. (US 6,311,064). Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffel (WO/99/01001) in view of English (US 5,870,674) and Bamburak et al. (US 6,311,064), as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Haberman, et al. US 5,613,204. Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffel (WO/99/01001) in view of English (US 5,870,674) and Bamburak et al. (US 6,311,064), as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Lynch, et al. US 5,586,338. Claims 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffel (WO/99/01001) in view of English (US 5,870,674). Claims 23 and 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffel (WO/99/01001) in view of English (US 5,870,674) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Haberman, et al. (US 5,613,204). Claims 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffel (WO/99/01001) in view of English (US 5,870,674) and Haberman, et al. (US 5,613,204), as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Schorman et al. (US 5,960,350).

The applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, and 21 to distinguish over the combination of references cited by the examiner. The applicant also amended dependent claims 8, 16, 17 to provide for proper antecedent basis. The applicant submits that the currently amended independent claims are now patentable over the combination of references cited by the examiner.

Raffel teaches, with reference to FIG. 5, a master search schedule stored in a memory 108 in the mobile device 100. The master search schedule can be initially programmed by the mobile device's manufacturer, distributor, or user. The master search schedule may be reprogrammed using signals received over the wireless communication channel.

Raffel further teaches: "The wireless telecommunications network then downloads these counter values to the mobile communication device to alter the order of search of the frequency bands of the master search schedule." (p. 21, lines 5-7)

English teaches that a subscriber station “maintains” a list of systems in a universal systems table 11 (col. 2, lines 26-47), “maintains” a geographic hypothesis table 10 (col. 2, lines 54-64), and “maintains” a most recently used (MRU) system table 9 (col. 2, line 65 – col. 3, line 13). The universal system table 11 “contains” system parameters for all communication systems which multi-mode subscriber station (MMSS) 1 knows exist. (col. 4, lines 21-22) The geographic hypothesis table 10 “contains” a list of system identifications (SIDs) each located in a different geographic region and necessary acquisition parameters including band, frequency, mode, and any other parameters necessary to perform acquisition on that system. (col. 4, lines 3-7) The most recent use (MRU) table 9 “contains” a list of communication systems that have been most recently used by MMSS 1. (col. 3, lines 65-67)

English further teaches that upon completion of service, system determination processor 8 in the subscriber station 1 “updates” a list of communication systems that have been most recently used by subscriber station 1 in the MRU table 9, in block 52, with the SID corresponding to the most recently acquired system. (col. 6, lines 47-48)

Bamburak teaches: “In another embodiment of the invention, the frequency spectrum is searched in a pre-determined order that changes based on information entered by a mobile communication device distributor or mobile communication device user. In yet another embodiment of the invention, the pre-determined order for searching the spectrum for service providers is updated by over the air programming. In still another embodiment of the present invention, the pre-determined order for searching is based on the mobile communication device's operational history.” (col. 3, line 63 - col. 4, line 5)

Bamburak further teaches: “The table in FIG. 9 may be programmed by the manufacturer, by the distributor when the phone is purchased or by the user. It is also possible to program the table of FIG. 9 over the air using restrictions similar to those used when programming the master search schedule over the air.” (col. 10, lines 19-23)

Bamburak further teaches: “The table of FIG. 10 may be programmed into memory 16 of the communication device by the device manufacturer, by the distributor or by the user via the keypad. It is also possible to program the table of FIG. 10 using over the air programming in a manner similar to that which was used for programming the search schedule of FIG. 8 or the prioritized table of service providers of FIG. 9. In some cases, there may not be a geographic

identifier or SID in the table of FIG. 10 for a identifier that is received from a control channel to which the communication device is tuned. In this case, the communications device executes the search algorithms discussed earlier in an effort to locate a desirable service provider. When a desirable service provider has been located, the table of FIG. 10 is updated to list the previously unlisted geographic identifier and the frequency at which a desirable service provider is located.” (col. 10, line 60 – col. 11, line 8)

Each of independent claims 1, 15, and 21 have been amended to include the concept that the mobile station stores or updates system priority data, including historical statistical information, in response to the mobile station initiating acquisition/registration attempts for each of a corresponding selected wireless communication system.

Support for the present amendment may be found in the specification, for example, in paragraphs 0008-0013.

The applicant respectfully submits that the amended independent claims 1, 15, and 21 distinguish over the combination of references cited by the examiner for at least the following reasons.

Raffel and Bamburak each teach that the table (e.g., master search schedule in Raffel) can be initially programmed by the mobile device’s manufacturer, distributor, or user, and then reprogrammed by the network. In contrast to Raffel, claims 1, 15, and 21 each claim that the mobile station initiates the acquisition/registration attempts causing the mobile station to store or update the system priority data, including historical statistical information.

Although English teaches “maintaining” each of the three tables 9, 10, and 11 in the subscriber station 1, each of which “contains” respective information, English does not appear to teach or suggest what created the information in each of the three tables 9, 10, and 11, or how the information is provided to each of the three tables 9, 10, and 11. English further teaches that upon completion of service, system determination processor 8 in the subscriber station 1 “updates” a list of communication systems that have been most recently used by subscriber station 1 in the MRU table 9. In contrast to English, claims 1, 15, and 21 claim that the mobile station initiates the acquisition/registration attempts to cause the mobile station to store or update the system priority data, including historical statistical information. Further in contrast to English, the claimed initiated acquisition/registration attempts are not the same as English’s “completion of service.” As claimed in claim 1, for example, the mobile station attempts to

acquire service after reprioritizing the systems.

Any combination of Raffel, English and/or Bamburak do not teach or suggest the combination of limitations claimed that the mobile station initiates the acquisition/registration attempts causing the mobile station to store or update the system priority data, including historical statistical information.

The present invention, as claimed in claims 1, 15, and 21, advantageously improves efficiency of the system acquisition/registration process as described in the specification at paragraph 0032, for example.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the present rejection of each of independent claims 1, 15, and 21 be withdrawn. Since each of independent claims 1, 15, and 21 appear to be allowable over the combination of cited references, the claims dependent on independent claims 1, 15, and 21 should also be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of the response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 17-0026. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrea L. Mays/

Andrea L. Mays

Reg. No. 43,721

Attorney for Assignee

Under 37 CFR §1.34(a)

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive G-225D
San Diego, CA 92121
Tel.: (858) 651-8546
Fax: (858) 658-2502